

REMARKS

Claims 14, 17, 18, and 20 through 30 are pending in this Application. Claims 14, 17, 18, and 21 through 23 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the Abstract, FIGs. 3 and 5, ¶¶[0036], and [0044] through [0046] of the corresponding US Pub. No. 2006/0128411. Applicant submits that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

Telephone Interview of November 2, 2009.

Applicant expresses appreciation for the Examiner's courtesy in granting and conducting a telephone interview on November 2, 2009. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the present claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record. It is with that understanding that the present Amendment is submitted.

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of adequate descriptive support.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that the recitation of "a computer-readable medium" (presumably intending "a computer-readable tangible storage medium") is not adequately described in the original specification. This rejection is traversed.

The application recites that at least a "phonebook application 302" is depicted in the user terminal UT in FIG. 3 and described in many paragraphs of the specification. Certainly one having ordinary skill in the art would understand that a user terminal has a memory which constitutes "a computer-readable tangible storage medium," that at least stores a phonebook and, hence, constitutes adequate descriptive support for "a computer-readable tangible storage

medium”, because it supports the phonebook application to provide “the user with a tool for maintaining and managing contact information, such as telephone numbers, names, addresses, presence information, etc. of desired individuals or groups (§ [0036])”.

Applicant therefore submits that the imposed rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 failing to comply with the written description requirement is not factually viable and, hence, solicit withdrawal thereof.

Claims 13, 14, 17, 18, and 20 through 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that the meaning of “deleting the ad-hoc group when said new ad-hoc group call ends” is not clear. This rejection is traversed.

In response, claims 14, 17, 18, and 21 through 23 have been clarified by reciting “deleting the user's selection of the ad-hoc group from the phonebook when said new ad-hoc group call ends”, thereby overcoming the stated basis for the rejection. Applicant therefore solicits withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13, 14, 17, 18, and 20 through 30 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 14, 17, 18, and 20 through 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness predicated upon *Mathis* (US 2003/0119540, “*Mathis*”) in view of *Griffin et al.* (US 2003/0155447, “*Griffin*”) and *Lopponen et al.* (US 2002/0150091, “*Lopponen*”).

In the statement of the rejection the Examiner concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to modify *Mathis*’s push-to-talk group call method by including *Griffin*’s new “ad-hoc” group selecting step to allow the user flexibility to dynamically select who to talk to without being restricted tot a predefined group. The Examiner further concluded

that that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to modify whatever system and method can be said to have been reasonably suggested by the combined disclosures of *Mathis* and *Griffin* by including *Lopponen*'s features of sending speech item based on setting defined in user plane functions and releasing a link and the bears when a group call ends, to preset logical connections and shorten a connection set-up time. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 14, 17, 18, and 21 through 23 recite, *inter alia*, “storing a list of subscribers of a phonebook application **into a phonebook stored** in a subscriber device; ... deleting **the user's selection of** the ad-hoc group **from the phonebook** when said new ad-hoc group call ends.”

The phonebook application provides the user with a tool for maintaining and managing contact information, such as telephone numbers, names, addresses, presence information, etc. of desired individuals or **groups** (§ [0032]). For example, the phonebook application may command the group communication client application to login to the group communications service and to **create** an ad-hoc group containing the selected contacts and the initiating user (step 508 in FIG. 5; step 603 in FIG. 6; § [0041]). The initiating user may end/leave the group call by pressing an “on-hook” key. When the phonebook application detects “end-of-call” input from the user, it commands the PoC application to end the call and **delete** the user's selection of the ad-hoc group from the phonebook (“The groups should often be created spontaneously for temporary use. ... a group call service in a mobile terminal and an infrastructure should offer an easy mechanism to form groups that have a short life and an easy-to-make group call” § § [0006], [0044]; steps 510 and 511 in FIG. 5). Examples of the rules Include deleting the group when the initiator leaves the group call, deleting the group when all group members leave the group call, or deleting the group after a certain idle time without any speech traffic (§ [0045]).

As acknowledged by the Examiner during the telephone interview, the present claim amendments overcome the rejections of record. Applicant, therefore, submits that the imposed rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 for obviousness predicated upon *Mathis*, *Griffin* and *Lopponen* is not factually or legally viable and, hence, solicit withdrawal thereof.

Based upon the foregoing, it is apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome, and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is therefore solicited. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at 703-519-9954 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

November 12, 2009

Date

/Arthur J. Steiner/

Arthur J. Steiner

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 26106

Chih-Hsin Teng

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 63168

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9951
Fax (703) 519-9958